

## UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

for the

Southern District of Texas

ENTERED

September 26, 2018

David J. Bradley, Clerk

United States of America )  
 v. )  
 ) Case No. H-18-1203M  
 Jose Manuel Gonzalez Testino )  
 Defendant )

## ORDER OF DETENTION PENDING TRIAL

## Part I - Eligibility for Detention

Upon the

Motion of the Government attorney pursuant to 18 U.S.C. § 3142(f)(1), or  
 Motion of the Government or Court's own motion pursuant to 18 U.S.C. § 3142(f)(2),

the Court held a detention hearing and found that detention is warranted. This order sets forth the Court's findings of fact and conclusions of law, as required by 18 U.S.C. § 3142(i), in addition to any other findings made at the hearing.

## Part II - Findings of Fact and Law as to Presumptions under § 3142(e)

A. **Rebuttable Presumption Arises Under 18 U.S.C. § 3142(e)(2) (*previous violator*)**: There is a rebuttable presumption that no condition or combination of conditions will reasonably assure the safety of any other person and the community because the following conditions have been met:

(1) the defendant is charged with one of the following crimes described in 18 U.S.C. § 3142(f)(1):  
 (a) a crime of violence, a violation of 18 U.S.C. § 1591, or an offense listed in 18 U.S.C. § 2332b(g)(5)(B) for which a maximum term of imprisonment of 10 years or more is prescribed; **or**  
 (b) an offense for which the maximum sentence is life imprisonment or death; **or**  
 (c) an offense for which a maximum term of imprisonment of 10 years or more is prescribed in the Controlled Substances Act (21 U.S.C. §§ 801-904), the Controlled Substances Import and Export Act (21 U.S.C. §§ 951-971), or Chapter 705 of Title 46, U.S.C. (46 U.S.C. §§ 70501-70508); **or**  
 (d) any felony if such person has been convicted of two or more offenses described in subparagraphs (a) through (c) of this paragraph, or two or more State or local offenses that would have been offenses described in subparagraphs (a) through (c) of this paragraph if a circumstance giving rise to Federal jurisdiction had existed, or a combination of such offenses; **or**  
 (e) any felony that is not otherwise a crime of violence but involves:  
 (i) a minor victim; (ii) the possession of a firearm or destructive device (as defined in 18 U.S.C. § 921);  
 (iii) any other dangerous weapon; or (iv) a failure to register under 18 U.S.C. § 2250; **and**

(2) the defendant has previously been convicted of a Federal offense that is described in 18 U.S.C. § 3142(f)(1), or of a State or local offense that would have been such an offense if a circumstance giving rise to Federal jurisdiction had existed; **and**

(3) the offense described in paragraph (2) above for which the defendant has been convicted was committed while the defendant was on release pending trial for a Federal, State, or local offense; **and**

(4) a period of not more than five years has elapsed since the date of conviction, or the release of the defendant from imprisonment, for the offense described in paragraph (2) above, whichever is later.

**B. Rebuttable Presumption Arises Under 18 U.S.C. § 3142(e)(3) (narcotics, firearm, other offenses):** There is a rebuttable presumption that no condition or combination of conditions will reasonably assure the appearance of the defendant as required and the safety of the community because there is probable cause to believe that the defendant committed one or more of the following offenses:

- (1) an offense for which a maximum term of imprisonment of 10 years or more is prescribed in the Controlled Substances Act (21 U.S.C. §§ 801-904), the Controlled Substances Import and Export Act (21 U.S.C. §§ 951-971), or Chapter 705 of Title 46, U.S.C. (46 U.S.C. §§ 70501-70508);
- (2) an offense under 18 U.S.C. §§ 924(c), 956(a), or 2332b;
- (3) an offense listed in 18 U.S.C. § 2332b(g)(5)(B) for which a maximum term of imprisonment of 10 years or more is prescribed;
- (4) an offense under Chapter 77 of Title 18, U.S.C. (18 U.S.C. §§ 1581-1597) for which a maximum term of imprisonment of 20 years or more is prescribed; **or**
- (5) an offense involving a minor victim under 18 U.S.C. §§ 1201, 1591, 2241, 2242, 2244(a)(1), 2245, 2251, 2251A, 2252(a)(1), 2252(a)(2), 2252(a)(3), 2252A(a)(1), 2252A(a)(2), 2252A(a)(3), 2252A(a)(4), 2260, 2421, 2422, 2423, or 2425.

**C. Conclusions Regarding Applicability of Any Presumption Established Above**

- The defendant has not introduced sufficient evidence to rebut the presumption above, and detention is ordered on that basis. *(Part III need not be completed.)*

**OR**

- The defendant has presented evidence sufficient to rebut the presumption, but after considering the presumption and the other factors discussed below, detention is warranted.

### **Part III - Analysis and Statement of the Reasons for Detention**

After considering the factors set forth in 18 U.S.C. § 3142(g) and the information presented at the detention hearing, the Court concludes that the defendant must be detained pending trial because the Government has proven:

- By clear and convincing evidence that no condition or combination of conditions of release will reasonably assure the safety of any other person and the community.
- By a preponderance of evidence that no condition or combination of conditions of release will reasonably assure the defendant's appearance as required.

In addition to any findings made on the record at the hearing, the reasons for detention include the following:

- Weight of evidence against the defendant is strong
- Subject to lengthy period of incarceration if convicted
- Prior criminal history
- Participation in criminal activity while on probation, parole, or supervision
- History of violence or use of weapons
- History of alcohol or substance abuse
- Lack of stable employment
- Lack of stable residence
- Lack of financially responsible sureties
- Lack of significant community or family ties to this district

- Significant family or other ties outside the United States
- Lack of legal status in the United States
- Subject to removal or deportation after serving any period of incarceration
- Prior failure to appear in court as ordered
- Prior attempt(s) to evade law enforcement
- Use of alias(es) or false documents
- Background information unknown or unverified
- Prior violations of probation, parole, or supervised release

OTHER REASONS OR FURTHER EXPLANATION:

See attached continuation sheet.

**Part IV - Directions Regarding Detention**

The defendant is remanded to the custody of the Attorney General or to the Attorney General's designated representative for confinement in a corrections facility separate, to the extent practicable, from persons awaiting or serving sentences or being held in custody pending appeal. The defendant must be afforded a reasonable opportunity for private consultation with defense counsel. On order of a court of the United States or on request of an attorney for the Government, the person in charge of the corrections facility must deliver the defendant to a United States Marshal for the purpose of an appearance in connection with a court proceeding.

Date:

9/26/18



United States Magistrate Judge

United States v. Jose Manuel Gonzalez Testino, H-18-1203M

(Continuation Sheet)

The court found probable cause to believe that the Defendant conspired to commit and did commit violations of the Foreign Corrupt Practices Act, in violation of 18 U.S.C. § 371 and 15 U.S.C. §78dd-2. The Defendant bribed members of the Venezuelan company Bariven, S.A., which is a subsidiary of Petroleos de Venezuela S.A. ("PDVSA"). It is undisputed that PDVSA and its subsidiaries are owned by the Venezuelan government. The defendant is responsible for approximately \$629,000 in bribes to a high-level executive of Bariven, in exchange for, among other things, the awarding of contracts to the Defendant's companies, and the payment on those contracts in U.S. dollars, instead of Venezuelan Bolivars, which was at the time declining in value.

The defendant has family and financial ties in the United States, but the facts below outweigh those ties and demonstrate by at least a preponderance of the evidence that the defendant poses a substantial risk of flight, and that there is no condition or combination of conditions that will ensure the defendant's appearance in court.

It is undisputed that the Defendant owns an expensive car and substantial real property in several countries. The Defendant did not disclose these assets when asked in open court, under oath, during his initial appearance in Florida. Making a false statement in open court is a strong indication that the defendant cannot comply with court rules if released. Moreover, access to these significant assets in foreign countries demonstrates that the Defendant could sustain himself outside of the United States if he were to flee.

It is undisputed that the defendant knew that federal agents were investigating him. He told two witnesses that he was therefore preparing to flee the United States to Venezuela to avoid prosecution. He instructed two witnesses to destroy evidence to prevent the government from seizing it. The defendant was arrested at the airport on his way to Venezuela. These facts are a strong indication that the defendant will flee if released. Instructing witnesses and co-conspirators to destroy evidence is strong evidence that the defendant cannot abide by court rules if released.

The defendant has strong financial ties to Venezuela. He also has access through his family to significant financial assistance. The defendant proffered that if released his father would pay nearly \$5,000 per day for a private security company to monitor him. This indicates to the court that the Defendant has access to substantial funds were he to flee the jurisdiction. The defendant has travelled on dozens of occasions over the past few years to and from Venezuela. He used three passports to travel -- two Venezuelan passports and one United States passport. One of the Venezuelan passports has a place of birth listed as Venezuela, while the other two list the United States.